IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DANIEL SIEGFRIED,

Plaintiff,

C.A. No.:

 \mathbf{v}_{\cdot}

McNEIL CONSUMER & SPECIALTY
PHARMACEUTICALS, A DIVISION OF
McNEIL-PPC, INC., a foreign corporation,

McNEIL-PPC, INC., a foreign corporation,
JOHNSON & JOHNSON-MERCK
CONSUMER PHARMACEUTICALS CO.,
a foreign corporation, and JOHNSON &
JOHNSON, a foreign corporation,

JURY OF SIX DEMANDED

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

PARTIES

- Plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, is an individual who resides at P.O. Box 382,
 Analomink, Pennsylvania 18320.
- Defendant, McNeil Consumer & Specialty Pharmaceuticals, a division of McNeil-PPC, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "McNeil"), is a foreign corporation whose principal place of business is located at 7050 Camp Hill Road, Fort Washington, Pennsylvania 19034.

 [DENIAL OF THIS ALLEGATION BY THE DEFENDANT MUST BE MADE BY AFFIDAVIT PURSUANT TO 10 Del. C. § 3915].
- 3. Defendant, Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., is a foreign corporation whose principal place of business is located at 7050 Camp Hill Road, Fort Washington, Pennsylvania 19034. [DENIAL OF THIS ALLEGATION BY THE DEFENDANT MUST BE MADE BY AFFIDAVIT PURSUANT TO 10 Del. C. § 3915].
- 4. Defendant, Johnson & Johnson, is a foreign corporation whose principal place of business is located at One Johnson & Johnson Plaza, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08933.

Doroshow, Pasquale, Krawitz & Bhaya 1202 Kirkwood Highway Wilmington, Delaware 19805 302-998-0100 [DENIAL OF THIS ALLEGATION BY THE DEFENDANT MUST BE MADE BY AFFIDAVIT PURSUANT TO 10 Del. C. § 3915].

JURISDICTION

- 5. Paragraphs 1 through 4 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 6. Jurisdiction is conferred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332(a)(1) and § 1332(c)(1) as the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00 and the action is between citizens of different states. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(a), as this is the judicial district in which some of the defendants reside and the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this claim occurred.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. On or about June 5, 2005, at approximately 11:00 a.m., the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, was a passenger on the back of a "Team Tylenol" promotional golf cart, at the Dover International Speedway in Dover, Delaware.
- 8. At the aforementioned time and place, the golf cart, recklessly operated by an unidentified employee, made a sharp turn on the racetrack, throwing the plaintiff off the back of the cart onto the blacktop track, resulting in severe personal injuries to the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried.
- 9. On the above-mentioned date, the unidentified operator of the golf cart was an employee of McNeil and/or Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co. and/or Johnson & Johnson, and was acting within the scope of his employment.
- At all times relevant, the defendant, McNeil, owned, maintained, managed, and/or controlled the golf cart and was responsible for the promotional campaign at the Dover Motor Speedway.

Doroshow, Pasquale. Krawitz & Bhaya 1202 Kirkwood Highway Wilmington. Delaware 19805 302-008-0100

- At all times relevant, the defendant, Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., owned, maintained, managed, and/or controlled the golf cart and was responsible for the promotional campaign at the Dover Motor Speedway.
- 12. At all times relevant, the defendant, Johnson & Johnson owned, maintained, managed, and/or controlled the golf cart and was responsible for the promotional campaign at the Dover Motor Speedway.

<u>COUNT I</u> <u>CLAIM AGAINST McNEIL</u>

- 13. Paragraphs 1 through 12 are incorporated by reference.
- 14. The direct and proximate cause of the plaintiff's injuries was the negligence of the defendant, McNeil, its agents, servants and/or employees while acting in the course and scope of their employment.
- 15. The negligence of McNeil, agents, servants, and/or employees is imputed onto the defendant, McNeil.
- 16. The unknown employee, who operated the golf cart, was an employee of the defendant, McNeil, acting within the scope of his employment at all times relevant.
- 17. A proximate cause of the aforesaid collision was the negligence of the defendant, McNeil, by negligently hiring the unidentified employee, whom they knew or should have known would act in a manner likely to cause injury to third persons.
- 18. Defendant, McNeil, did not use reasonable care in selecting an employee, specifically the operator of the golf cart, competent for the work intended.
- 19. The defendant, McNeil, by negligently hiring a person whom they knew or should have known would act in a manner likely to cause injuries to third parties, acted in a manner which constituted willful and wanton disregard for the safety of others, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried.

Doroshow, Pasquale. Krawitz & Bhaya 1202 Kirkwood Highway Wilmington, Delaware 19805 302-998-0100

- 20. The direct and proximate result of the accident was the negligence of the defendant, McNeil, as follows:
- (a) It knew or should have known of the existence of an unsafe condition on its property, namely the slippery substance on the seats of the golf cart;
 - (b) It failed to provide a seat restraining device;
- (c) It failed to take adequate steps to prevent the dangerous conditions then existing;
- (d) It failed to remedy the dangerous conditions within a reasonable period of time after it became aware or should have become aware of the dangerous condition;
- (e) It failed to take reasonable precautions to prevent this accident from happening;
 - (f) It failed to maintain its property in a safe condition;
- (g) It failed to adequately remove dangerous conditions from its property so it
 would be safe for individuals to sit on said property;
- (h) It failed to provide an alternate location for the plaintiff to sit to prevent individuals from encountering the dangerous condition;
- (i) It acted with willful or wanton disregard for the safety of others, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried.
- (j) It failed to fulfill its duty to protect individuals riding on the vehicle, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, from dangerous conditions.
- (k) It failed to adequately supervise and/or train its employees including the employee that operated the vehicle;
 - (l) It was otherwise negligent.

COUNT II CLAIM AGAINST JOHNSON & JOHNSON- MERCK CONSUMER PHARMACUETICALS CO.

- 21. Paragraphs 1 through 20 are incorporated by reference.
- The direct and proximate cause of the plaintiff's injuries was the negligence of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson- Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., its agents, servants and/or employees while acting in the course and scope of their employment.
- 23. The negligence of Johnson & Johnson- Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co.'s agents, servants, and/or employees is imputed onto the defendant, Johnson & Johnson- Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co..
- 24. The unknown employee, who operated the golf cart, was an employee of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson- Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., acting within the scope of his employment at all times relevant.
- 25. A proximate cause of the aforesaid collision was the negligence of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson- Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., by negligently hiring the unidentified employee, whom they knew or should have known would act in a manner likely to cause injury to third persons.
- 26. Defendant, Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., did not use reasonable care in selecting an employee, specifically the operator of the golf cart, competent for the work intended.
- 27. The defendant, Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., by negligently hiring a person whom they knew or should have known would act in a manner likely to cause injuries to third parties, acted in a manner which constituted willful and wanton disregard for the safety of others, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried.
- 28. The direct and proximate result of the accident was the negligence of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co., as follows:

Doroshow, Pasquale, Krawitz & Bhaya 1202 Kirkwood Highway Wilmington, Delaware 19805 302-998-0100

- (a) It knew or should have known of the existence of an unsafe condition on its property, namely the slippery substance on the seats of the golf cart;
 - (b) It failed to provide a seat restraining device;
- (c) It failed to take adequate steps to prevent the dangerous conditions then existing;
- (d) It failed to remedy the dangerous conditions within a reasonable period of time after it became aware or should have become aware of the dangerous condition;
- (e) It failed to take reasonable precautions to prevent this accident from happening;
 - (f) It failed to maintain its property in a safe condition;
- (g) It failed to adequately remove dangerous conditions from its property so it
 would be safe for individuals to sit on said property;
- (h) It failed to provide an alternate location for the plaintiff to sit to prevent individuals from encountering the dangerous condition;
- (i) It acted with willful or wanton disregard for the safety of others, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried.
- (j) It failed to fulfill its duty to protect individuals riding on the vehicle, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, from dangerous conditions.
- (k) It failed to adequately supervise and/or train its employees including the employee that operated the vehicle;
 - (l) It was otherwise negligent.

COUNT III CLAIM AGAINST JOHNSON & JOHNSON

29. Paragraphs 1 through 28 are incorporated by reference.

- 30. The direct and proximate cause of the plaintiff's injuries was the negligence of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson, its agents, servants and/or employees while acting in the course and scope of their employment.
- 31. The negligence of Johnson & Johnson's agents, servants, and/or employees is imputed onto the defendant, Johnson & Johnson.
- 32. The unknown employee, who operated the golf cart, was an employee of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson, acting within the scope of his employment at all times relevant.
- A proximate cause of the aforesaid collision was the negligence of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson, by negligently hiring the unidentified employee, whom they knew or should have known would act in a manner likely to cause injury to third persons.
- 34. Defendant, Johnson & Johnson, did not use reasonable care in selecting an employee, specifically the operator of the golf cart, competent for the work intended.
- 35. The defendant, Johnson & Johnson, by negligently hiring a person whom they knew or should have known would act in a manner likely to cause injuries to third parties, acted in a manner which constituted willful and wanton disregard for the safety of others, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried.
- 36. The direct and proximate result of the accident was the negligence of the defendant, Johnson & Johnson, as follows:
- (a) It knew or should have known of the existence of an unsafe condition on its property, namely the slippery substance on the seats of the golf cart;
 - (b) It failed to provide a seat restraining device;
- (c) It failed to take adequate steps to prevent the dangerous conditions then existing;
- (d) It failed to remedy the dangerous conditions within a reasonable period of time after it became aware or should have become aware of the dangerous condition;

Doroshow, Pasquale. Krawitz & Bhaya 1202 Kirkwood Highway Wilmington, Delaware 19805 302-998-0100

- (e) It failed to take reasonable precautions to prevent this accident from happening;
 - (f) It failed to maintain its property in a safe condition;
- (g) It failed to adequately remove dangerous conditions from its property so it
 would be safe for individuals to sit on said property;
- (h) It failed to provide an alternate location for the plaintiff to sit to prevent individuals from encountering the dangerous condition;
- (i) It acted with willful or wanton disregard for the safety of others, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried.
- (j) It failed to fulfill its duty to protect individuals riding on the vehicle, including the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, from dangerous conditions.
- (k) It failed to adequately supervise and/or train its employees including the employee that operated the vehicle;
 - (l) It was otherwise negligent.

<u>CLAIM IV</u> CLAIM OF DANIEL SIEGFRIED

- 37. Paragraphs 1 through 36 are incorporated by reference.
- 38. As a direct and proximate result of the defendants' negligence, the plaintiff,
 Daniel Siegfried, suffered personal injuries both of a temporary and permanent nature, including,
 but not limited to: injuries to the thoracic and lumbar spine.
- 39. As a consequence of his injuries, the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, has been required to undergo prolonged medical treatment, including but not limited to interventional procedures such as sacroiliac joint and selective nerve blocks and epidurals.

- As a further consequence of his injuries, the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, has 40. experienced, continues to experience and is likely to experience in the future, substantial physical pain and suffering, and discomfort.
- As a further consequence of his injuries, the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, has 41. experienced, continues to experience and is likely to experience in the future, emotional pain suffering, anxiety and nervousness.
- As a further result of the defendants' negligence, the plaintiff, Daniel Siegfried, 42. has incurred, and may in the future continue to incur, medical bills for the treatment of the injuries sustained in the accident.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff prays that this Court enter judgment against the defendants, McNeil Consumer & Specialty Pharmaceuticals, a division of McNeil-PPC, Inc., Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharmaceuticals Co. and Johnson & Johnson, jointly and severally, for all compensatory and special damages and the cost of this action, along with any additional relief that the Court may deem proper

2-02-07

By:

ARTHUR M. KRAWITZ (LD. NO.: 2440)

MATTHEW R. FOGG (L/D/NO.: 4254)

1202 Kirkwood Highway Wilmington, DE 19805

DOROSHOW, PASQUALE, MWITZ & BHAYA

(302) 998-0100

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ArthurKrawitz@dplaw.com

MattFogg@dplaw.com

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

07-118

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE IN	STRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	MINER & S	overigity Pharmaceutia		
DANIEL	SIEGFRIED	DEFENDANTS MCNEIL CONSUMER & Specialty Pharmaceutic adivision of McNeil-ppc, Inc., Johnson & Johnson-Merch Gonsumer Pharmaceuticals Co county of Residence of First Listed Defendant Fort Washington, PA				
		Johnson-Me	rck Consumer	Pharmaceuticalsco		
(b) County of Residence		County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant	FOR WAShington, PA		
(E)	(CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	NOTE: IN LAND	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF CONDEMNATION CASES, U.S. (1997)	•		
			INVOLVED.	SETTIE BOOKITOIN OF THE		
(a) August 1 (a)		Attornous (IFV name)				
Arthur M. K	Address, and Telephone Number)	Attorneys (If Known)				
Doroshow, Pa	rawitz, mathew R. (13) of they, willing on DE	naga-				
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place and X in One Box for Plaintiff		
(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Detendant)						
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		FF DEF ☐ I Incorporated or Pr	rincipal Place DEF		
7 0	Marine in	OV. 64 0 64	of Business In Thi	7		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and of Business In	Another State		
	(mucate Chizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subject of a	3 Toreign Nation	.		
		Foreign Country	5 C 5 Totolgu Hadon	2 3 3 3		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	D A SHADATRATANA	OTHER CTATHERS		
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		BANKRUPTCY 3 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES ☐ 400 State Reapportionment		
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury	- 🗇 620 Other Food & Drug	423 Withdrawal	410 Antitrust		
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury		28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce		
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability Slander 368 Asbestos Person	630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 820 Copyrights	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and		
151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	650 Airline Regs.	☐ 830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations		
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability Liability 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER	TY 660 Occupational Safety/Health	3 840 Trademark	☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV		
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	690 Other	COCIAL CECUMITY	☐ 810 Selective Service		
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 371 Truth in Lending 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Personal	LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 3 861 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange		
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Damage		☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410		
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal Product Liability	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions		
☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO		☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act		
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca ☐ 442 Employment Sentence	te 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act		
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	3 895 Freedom of Information		
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 530 General 535 Death Penalty		26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination		
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & Ot Employment 550 Civil Rights	her		Under Equal Access to Justice		
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condition		İ	☐ 950 Constitutionality of		
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights			State Statutes		
T. ODYCENI						
Maria III a	an "X" in One Box Only)	3 4 Reinstated or 5 Trans	ferred from D 6 Multidistr	Appeal to District Judge from		
// Original K	emoved from 13 Remanded from Late Court Appellate Court	Reinstated or Sanother Reopened Speci	er district	nct – Magistrate		
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictions		391/4		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cause:		,	5-11(a)		
THE TRAINSON IN	Maintiff was 42-naon					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DEMAND S	•	if demanded in complaint:		
			JURY DEMAND:	Yes No		
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER			
2/23/07	SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEY OF RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
PECETIFF # 1ULS & SUCCESS						
RECEIPT# 465 AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE						
			,			

MAY Consent 155Wd SI-3

Dowslow Pasavare

AO	FO	RM	85	RECEIP	Τ(REV	', 9/	04)
	-		_					

United States District Court for the District of Delaware

Civil Action No. 0 7 - 1 1 8

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT FOR AO FORM 85

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION

I HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE REC	CEIPT OF COPIES OF AO FORM 85.
2/26/07	Oh han
(Date forms issued)	(Signature of Party or their Representative)
	Chris Warnick
•	(Printed name of Party or their Representative)
Note: Completed receipt will be filed	in the Civil Action